

The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



***A Grammar of the Latin Language* by E. A. Andrews and S. Stoddard. Revised by Henry Preble of Harvard University. Boston. U. S. A. Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1888. \ \$ 1.12.**

Tracy Peck

The Classical Review / Volume 3 / Issue 05 / May 1889, pp 218 - 219
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00194995, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00194995

How to cite this article:

Tracy Peck (1889). The Classical Review, 3, pp 218-219 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00194995

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

or

amota terrae tantus amor fugae
desideranti.

or

quicquid amabile
fallebat, ut quondam vagantis,
sponte redit, simulacra somni.

Such criticisms as the above are not intended as specimens of the lyrics, many of which are admirable; but, as the book is intended mainly to teach boys, nothing should be admitted which is not unexceptionable, and a lyric, like a sonnet, ought to be a perfectly polished gem. There is no excuse for nodding.

E. D. STONE.

The Order of Words in the Ancient Languages compared with that of the Modern Languages. By HENRI WEIL. Translated, with Notes and Additions, by CHARLES W. SUPER, Ph.D., President of the Ohio University. Boston: Ginn and Company. 1887. Pp. 114. 5s.

PRESIDENT SUPER has rendered a genuine service to classical scholarship by translating this essay, written originally for the doctorate (1844), and given to the public in two subsequent editions (1869, 1879).

In the modern languages the order of words is so largely determined by the grammatical construction that the course of thought, especially in prose, is often disturbed by its dependence on the syntactical arrangement; divers shifts and inversions are needed to preserve a natural sequence of ideas: in short, these languages are not *free*, there is a tyranny of the analytic method, of the so-called 'logical order.' But the Latin and the Greek are free languages, the spiritual movement is independent of the syntactical movement, thought flows clear and unimpeded, ideas assert their rightful precedence, and all the powers of oral expression attain to full and perfect exercise. Such is the author's thesis: the statement of an obvious truth, to be sure, but forming the groundwork for a systematic development of principles that are often enough ignored and disregarded in spite of their cardinal importance. The reader attends with growing interest as the subject is unfolded step by step—the natural order of words, the pathetic order, the period, descending and ascending construction, rhetorical accent, the repose of emphasis: a treatment at once concise and far-reaching, and unincumbered by superfluous learning.

It is easy to anticipate the familiar corollaries that spring from such a theme, but they seem to gain renewed force as our author evolves and illustrates them. 'In translating from one language to another, if it is not possible to imitate at the same time the syntax of the original and the order of the words, retain the order of the words and disregard the grammatical relations.' And again: 'The great secret of a good translation is to find forms of expression which will allow the translator to adopt into a foreign idiom the order of words which is found in the original.' In *Darium vicit Alexander* ('Darius was conquered by Alexander'), something is said about Darius, not about Alexander. *Alexander* is, to be sure, the grammatical subject of *vicit*, but what of that! The consciousness must not be allowed to dwell on the grammatical relations; they are the postulates of speech, grammar is the *sine qua non* of intelligibility, and for that reason can be left to take care of itself where intelligent beings are concerned. *Δαρείου καὶ Παρυσάτιδος γίγνονται παῖδες δύο* ('Darius and Parysatis had two sons'): the sentence begins with a genitive case, but what of it? The function of the genitive was not burdening the mind of Xenophon

when he began his story, and the function of the genitive is not to be flourished in the face of the learner as if it were something grand and awful. Far more significant is the arrangement with its harmonious effects and concomitants. The grammatical construction, the analytic principle is constantly pulling the learner in the wrong direction, diverting him from the path and blinding him to that which above all things he needs to see. In order to clear the way for him, to encourage and inspire him, you must bear as constantly toward the opposite pole. Early positive instruction in languages should always be synthetic: the analytical part is negative. You do not want your boy or girl to be grammatical (heaven forbid!), but only not to be ungrammatical. What he needs to be instructed in is the concrete: the combined effect and force of what he reads and writes. Recite to him whole masses of sonorous Latin and Greek; make him read the same aloud to you in the same way. Let him learn choice passages by heart; give him a chance to acquire a wide and discriminating vocabulary; set him to writing Greek and Latin in imitation of the models daily presented to his ear; guide him to express ideas, however simple, with clearness, euphony and energy. Such are the lessons we draw from Professor Weil's thoughtful and interesting work.

The translation, in the main well done, is at some points not satisfactory. A passage on p. 47 is rendered wholly unintelligible by an ambiguous thrice-occurring *it*. Another awkward ambiguity in the last four words of p. 61 might have been avoided without sacrificing the order of words illustrated, but the example is not suited for translation, and should have been given in the original French. The Greek and Latin illustrative passages when translated at all should have been translated in accordance with the doctrine inculcated by the essay itself, but this has not always been done. The words on p. 71, *τὸν εἰς τὴν χορηγίαν δαπανῶντα οὐκ εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν τάξιν δέει τιθέναι τῷ τοῦ χοροῦ διδασκάλῳ* (he who bears the expense of the representation ought not to be put in the same rank, &c.), are turned as follows: 'it is not necessary that we should put in the same rank him who bears the expense of the representation,' &c.—bungling and false for the French ('il ne faut pas mettre,' &c.) as for the Greek. The version given for the last example on p. 65 is both obscure and wrong. Of misprints there are a great many in the Greek text, not many in the Latin and the French, sciendam p. 18, soceram p. 27, ou p. 74, furtam p. 79, appidum twice p. 113. On p. 27, by an oversight in copying apparently, the French text of the disapproved version from Horace is appended to the English that represents the approved version.

As regards the Notes, whether the author's own or those added by the translator, any debatable points which they happen to touch involve nothing that in the least affects the validity of the main thesis; they are judiciously put at the ends of the several chapters so that it is left to the reader to use them or not, as he may find it expedient.

ISAAC FLAGG.
Cornell University.

A Grammar of the Latin Language by E. A. ANDREWS and S. STODDARD. Revised by HENRY PREBLE of Harvard University. Boston. U. S. A. Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1888. \$ 1.12.

THE ideal Latin grammar has not yet appeared, but such approaches have been made to a satisfactory standard that the credentials of any new comer are sure to be closely scanned. While a hearty welcome awaits any work that is the outcome of an inside and comprehensive grasp of Latin usages and that takes

due notice of the historic and cognate relations of the language, a mere revamping of an antiquated or obsolescent book or a mosaic of existing manuals hardly has a *raison d'être*.

When Andrews and Stoddard's Grammar appeared, now more than fifty years ago, it was distinctly superior to any kindred work to which American students had easy access and, after its revision in 1857, it was still for some time almost alone and unchallenged. Meanwhile not only have substantial advances been made in nearly every department of Latin scholarship, but new views have arisen as to the scope of a manual grammar. Few teachers now largely occupy their pupils with the vast multitude of details, the minute subdivision of constructive theories, and the deadening lists of exceptions to rules, which characterized the earlier grammars. Grammatical minutiae are much less treated as an end in themselves: the object is rather to get on, and intelligently to study the literature—not primarily as a verification of any grammarian's dicta, but as the expression and revelation of a wonderful civilization.

For those who still believe in the old method, Professor Preble has spoiled Andrews and Stoddard's Grammar by his free contraction, expansion, and rearrangement of the original, and by his insertion of modern matter. On the other hand we do not feel that he has brought the book up to the level of two or three current manuals.

The prominent facts of the language are in this revision somewhat relieved of their former mechanical statement, but there is slight suggestiveness toward an insight into the genesis and logic of constructions. Thus, no attempt is made to grapple with and explain such genuine Latinisms as the ablative absolute, the historical infinitive, indirect narrative, and the gerundial usages. The philology of the book is scrappy and inconclusive. There are glib references (§287) to the 'parent language,' but nowhere is there a synoptical or other sketch of the relations between Latin and its congeners. We are tantalizingly told (§403) that 'it has been a common theory that the original use of the ablative was to denote separation, but that the better opinion is that such is not the case.' Later on (§415) it is asserted that 'the ablative of separation is a variety of the ablative of specification.'

The editor calls special attention to his chapter on Word-Formation, but the treatment seems to us far less clear and scientific than in the corresponding sections of Greenough or Roby.

There are still so many unsolved problems in Latin syntax that here, certainly, dogmatism is out of place. We doubt if any scholars can accept Professor Preble's view of the genitive with *interest* (§363), or with words of fulness (§409 *a*), or the ablative with *opus* (§417), or the dative of the agent (§383 *b*).

More than anywhere else the reviser claims originality for his theory as to the order of words in Latin; but, as he frankly states (§599) that it would 'take too much space to set forth the reasons for his opinion,' we are left to his *ipse dixit*. After carefully going through his examples and statements we must still believe that there were heroes before Agememnon. As a general rule it may be admitted—particularly for the extremes of a Latin sentence—that the order of words was largely determined by the degree of emphasis. But in a very large part of Latin literature we cannot feel—and probably the Romans themselves did not feel—any such diminishing scale of emphasis as Professor Preble assumes. He carries the principle so far that it becomes over-rigid and forced; it leaves too little play for the natural elasticity of an inflected language; it ignores the unmistakable differences in different authors and periods; it takes too little account of euphony, chiasm, alliteration, and other more subtle devices of the Roman stylists; it disregards the free and often interlocked order of metrical composition.

The marking of long vowels throughout the grammar is a commendable feature, though the proof-reading has here been carelessly done. We have noticed, among other slips, *sērēnus*, *semita*, *nobis*, *qualis*, *manum*.

It is refreshing to find that Professor Preble ignores entirely the 'English method' of pronouncing Latin. It is certainly a reproach that this method is still advocated by some of the responsible guardians of Latin scholarship. The method ought long since to have followed the Ptolemaic system of astronomy into the limbo of unscientific curiosities.

TRACY PECK.
Yale University.

A LAST WORD.

I have but a few words to add in reference to Mr. Wilson's attempt at replying to my criticisms. I am in no wise concerned, as I have already said, with his opinion of my scholarship and philosophy, but only with his imputations of *mala fides*. I therefore refrain from all comment on his remarks, except as regards the point which he puts forward as a test question between himself and me and which beyond doubt answers that purpose admirably.

In attempting to justify his assertion that I attack Martin in a certain passage, he quotes part of my animadversions upon the contrary motion which, as is commonly thought, Plato assigns to Venus and Mercury.

This is no theory of Martin's, but a popular and obvious interpretation of Plato's words, which Martin repeats, presumably because he saw nothing better for it, but to which he urges the gravest objection. The passage cited from my note strongly emphasises the objection which Martin felt, and which any one must feel, to this astronomical hypothesis, and simply amplifies a sentence in the very same note, which is this: 'Now, as Martin observes, the theory of contrary motion is flagrantly inadequate to account for those facts.' The 'attack upon Martin' is actually and expressly an argument on Martin's side.

Now Mr. Wilson either saw this or he